



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,289	08/01/2003	Samuel Pearlman	PU 010211 CIP	5075
24498	7590	12/14/2004	EXAMINER	
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LICENSING INC			MCPHERSON, JOHN A	
JOSEPH S TRIPOLI			ART UNIT	
PO BOX 5312			PAPER NUMBER	
2 INDEPENDENCE WAY			1756	
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312			DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/632,289

Applicant(s)

PEARLMAN ET AL.

Examiner

John A. McPherson

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the specification does not provide basis for the subject matter of claims 16 and 17.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,013,400 to LaPeruta et al. (LaPeruta) in view of EP 0 146 226 (EP '226). LaPeruta discloses a method of manufacturing a luminescent screen with a light absorbing matrix, comprising the steps of exposing a first photoresist through a color selection electrode to light from at least two positions located symmetrically relative to a central source position, developing the first photoresist layer, overcoating with a light absorbing material, removing the remaining photoresist and the light absorbing material thereon to form first guardbands, and repeating the process twice more, using second and third photoresist layers and at least two asymmetrically located light source positions, to produce second and third guardbands (see the abstract and

column 5, line 57 to column 7, line 51). Additionally, LaPeruta teaches utilizing a tension focus mask as the color selection electrode, wherein the tension focus mask has a similar mask pitch, strand width and slot width as in the present invention. See column 5, lines 16-45 and column 8, lines 14-29. Therefore, the color selection electrode would have a similar transmission as set forth in claim 20 (as opposed to a conventional shadow mask with an area of the openings of about 18-22% of the area of the mask, see column 1, line 62 to column 2, line 7). However, LaPeruta does not disclose additionally exposing each photoresist from an inner source position, such that each photoresist is exposed from three source positions.

EP '226 discloses a "three light source exposure method" for forming black stripes on a panel of a cathode ray tube, wherein each of three photoresist layers are exposed from three positions, namely the reference position O (corresponding to the inner source position of the present invention) and two offset lateral positions  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  (see the abstract and page 5, line 31 to page 6, line 11). Furthermore, EP '226 teaches that the "three light source method" is an improvement over a "two light source method" comprising exposing only from positions  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  which are laterally offset in opposite directions from the reference position O (see page 2, line 13 to page 3, line 8), because in the "two light source method" the superimposed transmission light intensity distribution is not optimized (see Figure 3 for the "two light source method" distribution, as compared to the "three light source method" distribution of Figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the requisite art to utilize an additional exposure from the reference position, as taught by EP '226, in the process of

LaPeruta because it is taught that utilizing a third exposure from the reference position provides for an optimized light intensity distribution when forming a light absorbing matrix on the faceplate of a cathode ray tube by the lift-off method.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 9-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John A. McPherson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1386. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/632,289

Page 5

Art Unit: 1756

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic  
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John A. McPherson  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1756

JAM  
12/8/04